

REMARKS

Claim 11 has been amended, claim 13 has been cancelled without prejudice, and claims 17 through 19 have been added. No new matter has been added by virtue of the amendments. For instance, support for the amendments appears e.g. at pages 5, lines 10-13 and page 9, lines 5-7 of the application.

Claims 11-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Soorlyakumaran et al. (U.S. 2002/0081520). The rejection is traversed.

Thus, independent claim 11 (the only pending independent claim) calls for a photoresist resin that comprises three or more distinct repeat units.

Such higher order resins clearly not not disclosed or otherwise suggested by the Soorlyakumaran et al. document. See, for instances, the examples of Soorlyakumaran et al.

The Soorlyakumaran et al. citation also does not teach or otherwise suggest other aspects of Applicants' claimed invention. For instance, claims 17 and 19 call for acetal photoacid-labile groups. Soorlyakumaran et al. does not disclose such photoacid-labile groups. Claim 18 calls a resin that has four or more distinct repeat units. Soorlyakumaran et al. does not disclose such resins.

Accordingly, reconsiderations and withdrawal of the rejection are requested. See, for instance, *In re Marshall*, 198 USPQ at 346 ("[r]ejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 are proper only when the claimed subject matter is identically disclosed or described in the prior art."). See also Section 2143.03 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure ("To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.").

S. Kangasabapthy et al.
U.S.S.N. 10/785,424
Page 5

It is believed the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is
earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter F. Corless (Reg. 33,860)
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205
Telephone: 617-439-4444